

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patons and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/512,942	02/25/2000	THEODORE H. FEDYNYSHYN	101328-148	6865
21125 75	590 12/10/2002			
NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH LLP			EXAMINER	
WORLD TRADE CENTER WEST 155 SEAPORT BOULEVARD			CHU, JOHN S Y	
BOSTON, MA	02210-2604		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1752	15
			DATE MAIL ED: 12/10/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
		. , ,
- Advisory Action	09/512,942	FEDYNYSHYN, THEODORE H.
	Examiner	Art Unit
The MAILING DATE AND	John S. Chu	1752
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe		
THE REPLY FILED 25 November 2002 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applic	cation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advi event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 1706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dat have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more armed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE e on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in the statutory period for the statu	the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 36(a) and the appropriate extension fee fee. The appropriate extension fee under
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	s Brief must be filed within the p R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o	eriod set forth in
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	Secure:	2000 September 11 461775
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below)
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or		
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	-	inally rejected claims
NOTE:	to my na filipid	
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecting 	ion(s):	
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	———	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consi	idered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(explanation of how the new or amended claims wo	s) a) will not be entered or b) uld be rejected is provided belo	☐ will be entered and an w or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	14 · ·	
Claim(s) allowed: none.	8 6 2 1 1 No.	
Claim(s) objected to: 2-5.	* - 40 · • *	
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 6-17</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 18-21.		
3. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examiner
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement		
0. ☐ Other:		·
		John S. Chu Primary Examiner
Patent and Trademark Office		Art Unit: 1752

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The declaration under Rule 1.132 fails to provide objective evidence as to the base solubility of the photosensitive composition: The rejection remains only over claims 1 and 6-17, because the prior art fails to disclose the claimed binder of claims 2-5.